

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Attached hereto are three (3) replacement sheets of corrected formal drawings that comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. These replacement sheets, which depict Figures 10-12, replace the original sheets depicting Figures 10-12.

The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

The legend "Conventional Art" is added to the figures.

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

By this amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 9-11 and 13 are amended for clarity, claims 5 and 12 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thereto, and Figs. 10-12 are amended.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

#### **Drawing Corrections**

The Office Action objects to Figs. 10-12 because only that which is old is illustrated. (see Office Action, page 2).

Applicant respectfully points out that in amended Figures 10-12, the legend "Conventional Art" is added.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawing and further requests that the corrected drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

#### **The Claim Objections Are Obviated**

The Office Action objects to claims 1-12 for minor informalities contained therein. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to claims 1-4, 6 and 9-11 obviates the objection of the claims.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully points out that regarding the objection to claim 10, the examiner objects to claim 10 because the "buried portion" provided with a groove is misdescriptive and/or inaccurate. Applicant respectfully traverse this objection.

For example, the present invention discloses that, "the frame 11 contains a light-transmissive material having a high transmittance as used for a light guide plate" (see page 38,

lines 11-13 of the present specification). Additionally, in the present invention, “a wedge-like portion 11a is a buried portion in which a light-transmissive material is buried and serves as a light guide plate” (see page 38, lines 20-22). Furthermore, the present invention discloses that “the frame 11 is provided with a groove 11c for mounting a lamp along an end portion of the wedge-shaped portion 11a”.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that it is clearly evident that the present specification further defines the location of the groove as being along an end portion of the wedge-shaped portion 11a, wherein the wedge-shaped portion 11a is also described as being a buried portion.

Therefore, applicant submits that claim 10 which recites, “the buried portion is provided with a groove along at least an edge thereof...” is clear and supported by the specification of the present invention.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 1-12 is respectfully solicited.

#### The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects:

(1) claims 1, 2 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,116 to Yuuki et al. (hereafter Yuuki);

(2) claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,426,763 to Sagawa (hereafter Sagawa);

(3) claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by either Sagawa or Yuuki;

(4) claims 3, 5, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,199 to Ozawa (hereafter Ozawa);

(5) claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuuki in view of Japanese Reference JP 109931 to Haniyu (hereafter Haniyu) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,402,334 to Yu-San (hereafter Yu-San);

(6) claims 3, 5, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagawa in view of Yu-San; and

(7) claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagawa in view of Haniyu and Yu-San.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yuuki and/or Sagawa, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

As for Yuuki, the Examiner alleges that Yuuki discloses a light source (13) for generating light, and an element comprising a light guide plate (11) or a frame in Figures 2 to 4. (see Office Action, page 3). However, applicant respectfully submits that Yuuki fails to disclose the light source being configured as set forth in the present invention.

For example, Yuuki discloses that a columnar lamp (13) is disposed on one side of a light guide (11). The lamp (13) is surrounded by a reflector (14) having a polygonal cross section that is open only on the side facing the light guide (11). (see Yuuki, col. 5, lines 17-32). In other words, Yuuki discloses a lamp (13) that is configured outside the light guide (11) and a light guide (11) that fails to include a groove.

For instance, Yuuki fails to disclose that the guide plate includes a groove with an incident portion on a first side of the groove, as set forth in the present invention. In fact, the Examiner concedes that Yuuki fails to disclose a groove along at least an edge of the light guide. (see Office Action, page 4, last paragraph).

However, in an attempt to show the groove feature, the Examiner imports Ozawa. (see rejection of claims 3, 5, 10 and 12 on page 4). However, applicant respectfully submits that Ozawa fails to disclose a light reflective thin film being provided on the entire inner side of the groove except for the incident side (first side) thereof. Instead, Ozawa merely discloses a thick-walled portion 74 of the light guide plate 48 including a recess 80 formed therein at the bottom. In Ozawa, the thick-walled portion 74 is covered with a reflecting sheet 88. However, Ozawa

fails to disclose that the entire inner side of the recess 80, except for an incident side, is provided with a reflective thin film. At most, Ozawa may disclose the bottom half of the recess as being provided with a reflective thin film. (see Ozawa, Fig. 2 and also Office Action, page 5, first paragraph).

In other words, applicant submits that Yuuki, alone or in combination with Ozawa, fails to disclose the light guide plate having a groove being provided with a reflective thin film on the entire inner side except for the incident side.

As for Sagawa, the Examiner alleges that Sagawa discloses a light guide plate or frame (11, 21, 31) as claimed. (see Office Action, page 3, paragraph 6). However, as conceded by the Examiner, Sagawa fails to disclose a groove along at least an edge of the light guide plate and a light source provided in the groove and a light reflective film. (see Office Action, page 5, paragraph 11). In an attempt to show these features, the Examiner imports, Yu-San.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Yu-San discloses a groove, a light source provided in the groove and a light reflecting film 34 at col. 2, line 60. (see Office Action, page 6, first paragraph). However, a close review of Yu-San reveals that Yu-San merely discloses a panel 10 that may be used in a backlight assembly. Yu-San's panel 10 has a side edge that includes a pair of spaced apart notches 18. In Yu-San, a pair of light emitting diodes 32 may be located on the face of another panel 26, and the LEDs 32 have a size to be received in the notches 18 when the display panel is assembled. The main surface 34 of the base panel 26 in Yu-San may be painted white or provided with some type of reflective surface....(see Yu-San, col. 2, lines 37-63).

In other words, Yu-San merely uses a reflective type material for the base panel surface 34. However, Yu-San fails to disclose a light reflective thin film is being provided on the entire inner side of the groove/notch except for an incident thereof, as set forth in the present invention. In fact, Yu-San's notches 18 fail to include any type of reflective film. As such, applicant submits that Yu-San fails to make up for the deficiencies found in Sagawa.

Furthermore, applicant submits Haniyu also fails to make up for the deficiencies noted above.

According to MPEP §2131, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of anticipation because the cited references, Yuuki and Sagawa, each fail to anticipate and thus teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

As noted above, applicant also respectfully submits that Ozawa, Haniyu and Yu-San each fail to make up for the deficiencies found in Yuuki and Sagawa.

To establish a *prima facie* case of Obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combinations of Yuuki and Ozawa; Yuuki, Haniyu and Yu-San; Sagawa and Yu-San; and Sagawa, Haniyu and Yu-San each fail to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons noted above.

As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 **to schedule a Personal Interview.**

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Dated: August 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein  
Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Rd  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Three (3) replacement drawing sheets, Figs. 10-12